

**City of Issaquah**  
Development Services Department  
PO Box 1307, Issaquah, WA 98027-1307  
425/837-3094 Fax: 425/837-3089



<b>Project Title:</b> <b>Issaquah SD HS#4 and Elementary School #17 CAS</b>  <b>Wood Project: PS182000590.10</b>		<b>Documents Provided:</b> <u>Initial Review</u> A. Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report – Issaquah High School #4 and Elementary School #17, by Associated Earth Science, dated September 17, 2019 B. Landslide Hazard Assessment – Issaquah High School #4 and Elementary School #17, by Associated Earth Science, dated September 24, 2019 <u>Second Review</u> A. Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report – “Subsurface Exploration, Geologic Hazard”, Issaquah High School #4 and Elementary School #17, by Associated Earth Science, Revised February 24, 2021 B. Plan Set – Issaquah High School #4 and Elementary School #17, by AHBL, dated February 22, 2021 <u>Third Review</u> A. Geotechnical Engineering Report – “Subsurface Exploration, Geologic Hazard”, Issaquah High School #4 and Elementary School #17, by Associated Earth Science, Revised June 17, 2021 B. Plan Set – Issaquah High School #4 and Elementary School #17, by AHBL, Revised May 21, 2021				<b>Permit Number:</b>  <b>PRJ19-0008</b> (Initial Review) <b>SDP20-00001</b> (2nd Review)			
Date Received: <b>9/14/2020</b> (1st Review) <b>3/17/2021</b> (2nd Review) <b>6/25/2021</b> (3rd Review)		Reviewed By: <b>Wood E&amp;IS:</b> <b>1st Review:</b> Todd Wentworth, P.E. / Konrad Moeller L.E.G. <b>2nd Review:</b> Todd Wentworth, P.E. / Konrad Moeller L.E.G. <b>3rd Review:</b> Todd Wentworth, P.E. / Konrad Moeller L.E.G.		Phone: <b>425-368-0938</b>		Date: <b>9/24/2020</b> (1st Review Comments) <b>4/1/2021</b> (2nd Review Comments) <b>6/30/2021</b> (3rd Review Comments)		Sheet: <b>1 of 3</b>	

Com #	Report Sec.	September 24, 2020 <u>Initial Review Comments</u> R=Required / P=Presumed / C=Consider	March 17, 2021 <u>Initial Designer's Response</u>	April 1, 2021 <u>Second Review Comments</u> R=Required / P=Presumed / C=Consider	Second Designer's Response	June 30, 2021 <u>Third Review Comments</u> R=Required / P=Presumed / C=Consider	Third Designer's Response
		Document A addresses all geologic hazards, and document B contains the same information related to landslide hazards and do not address other hazards. <u>Therefore</u> , the report section listed below is for document.	Acknowledged	<u>Note:</u> Report section referenced in our initial 9/24/2020 Comments (1 to 3) are based on the 10/17/2019 Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report. The initial referenced sections do not correspond with the revised / reissued Preliminary Geotechnical Report, dated 2/21/2021.  The following comments address only the Geologic Hazard components of the project documents to date. Wood assumes an additional review concerning specific engineering components (walls, vaults, etc.) will be performed at a later date.		<u>Note:</u> As requested, Wood completed our 3rd geotechnical peer review of the above listed document to determine if our second review comments were addressed. The applicant did not provide / submit written responses to our 2R April 1, 2021 review comments.	
1	2.0; pg 2	Is the maximum cut at Cross-Section B-B'? Looks like there is also a significant fill at A-A', at the south end of the site. The maximum wall height is mentioned at the southwest portion of the site, is there a steep slope at that location? Please add clarifying information.	C of B-B' but the height of the steep slope is greater at B-B'. These is not currently a steep slope in the area of maximum wall height.	<b>Accepted</b>			
2	5.3; pg 13 and App B	Please provide a reference or lab testing to support the selection of soil strength properties for the slope stability analyses.	R The soil strength values used in our analysis are based on information provided in the 2019 WSDOT Manual. Please see Sec 5.3 of our revised report for details.	<b>Accepted</b>			

**City of Issaquah**  
 Development Services Department  
 PO Box 1307, Issaquah, WA 98027-1307  
 425/837-3094 Fax: 425/837-3089



Com #	Report Sec.	September 24, 2020 <u>Initial Review Comments</u> R Required / P=Presumed / C=Consider	March 17, 2021 <u>Initial Designer's Response</u>	April 1, 2021 <u>Second Review Comments</u> R=Required / P=Presumed / C=Consider	<u>Second Designer's Response</u>	June 30, 2021 <u>Third Review Comments</u> R=Required / P=Presumed / C=Consider	<u>Third Designer's Response</u>
3	5.3; pg 13 and App B	Please remove, or justify the use of cohesion for static, long-term stability analyses.	R The cohesion value applied to the till is conservatively low and within the range of published values in the WSDOT Manual. See Section 5.3 of our revised report.	Accepted			
4	Sec. 5.0			R Sec 5.0 "Landslide Hazards" uses the IMC 18.10.390 definition of a "Steep Slope Hazards" not the IMC definition of a "Landslide Hazard". The report should define and address both types of hazards, the pre- and post-impacts and/or any mitigation needed.		Revised geo report sufficiently defines steep slope / landslide hazards, addressed pre / post impacts and mitigation.  <u>Comment closed</u>	
5	Sec 2.0 & 5.4			R Localized steep slopes (undefined number / sizes) after demolition are discussed in Sec. 2.0. In Sec 6.0 "Landslide Hazard Mitigation" AESI states no plans were available that identified all the steep slopes. AESI recommended they review the final grading to verify the steep slopes were eliminated. Please clarify: 1. Per IMC definitions are they considered steep slopes or landslide hazards? 2. Has AESI reviewed the final grading plan as recommended?		Based on the revised geo report it appears AESI had reviewed final grading plans and sufficiently address our comment.  <u>Comment closed</u>	
6	Sec. 5.0 & 5.4			R Report states IMC criteria for steep slope buffer reductions but does not request a buffer reduction or identify locations of the steep slope if a buffer reduction is requested. The report should provide at a minimum: • A steep slope buffer reduction request, if intended; • A Figure identifying existing steep slopes (top & toe of slopes identified); and • A Post-grading Figure of all steep slopes which includes identification of top & toe of slope, buffer and building setback.  The Post-grading Figure should not include engineered slopes.		Revised geo report Sections 5.0, 5.4, 5.5 and Figures 3 through 5 sufficiently address our comments.  <u>Comment closed</u>	

**City of Issaquah**  
Development Services Department  
PO Box 1307, Issaquah, WA 98027-1307  
425/837-3094 Fax: 425/837-3089



Com #	Report Sec.	September 24, 2020 <u>Initial Review Comments</u> R Required / P=Presumed / C=Consider	March 17, 2021 <u>Initial Designer's Response</u>	April 1, 2021 <u>Second Review Comments</u> R=Required / P=Presumed / C=Consider	<u>Second Designer's Response</u>	June 30, 2021 <u>Third Review Comments</u> R=Required / P=Presumed / C=Consider	<u>Third Designer's Response</u>
7	Plan Set			R At a minimum the Plan Set should show all existing steep slopes and show all post-grading steep slopes (but not engineered slopes). The plan sheets should clearly identify top & toe of slope, buffer and building setbacks.		Revised plan set sufficiently identifies existing and post-graded steep slopes using a color code system that shows top and toe of slopes. Revised geo report section 5.4 clarifies after site grading any existing natural steep slopes will be greater than 50 feet from any structures.  <u>Comment closed</u>	
8	Sec 5.0 & 5.4			R Report requests exemptions for the steep slope at the very southeast of the project. Does the applicant intend to request exemptions to any other steep slopes within the project boundaries?		Revised geo report section 5.5 requested an exemption for steep slope alterations and grading under IMC 18.10.580E for slopes <20 feet high or that were created from previous grading activities. The report also requested a steep slope buffer and building setback reduction. Based on the information and engineering presented in the revised geo report it appears AESI has sufficiently addressed site steep slope geologic hazards on the site to justify the exemption and buffer reduction.  <u>Comment closed</u>	
9	Plan Set			C Plan Sheet C1.1 LU identifies Post-grading slope on the site with a maximum slope angle of 15-40% in Red and slope angles > 40% in Purple. Are these engineered slopes? To reduce confusion to reader, we suggest clarifying if these are engineered slopes and not subject to IMC concerning steep slope hazards or landslide hazards. However, the plan sheet should also include and identify actual steep slope or landside hazards per IMC with a different color code.		Revised plan set clarifies locations of all post-graded engineered slopes and existing steep slopes.  <u>Comment closed</u>	